1	2	3	4
11.	West Bengal	1	—
12.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	1	—
13.	Lakshadweep	8	—
	Total	216	5

Village Electrification through Solar and Biogas energy

255. KUMAR DEEPAK DAS: Will the Minister of NEW AND RENEWABLE ENERGY be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government has any proposal for village electrification, through solar and biogas energy, in Assam;

(b) if so, the details thereof, with the mode of electrification; and

(c) whether the remote villages of Barpeta Nalbari, Chirang and Bongaigaon districts of the State would be included under such programme?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF NEW AND RENEWABLE ENERGY (SHRI VILAS MUTTEMWAR): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. Under the Remote Village Electrification Programme of the Ministry, Central Financial Assistance of upto 90% of the costs of systems, has been approved for installation of solar homelighting systems in 1986 villages. The projects are being implemented in the state by the state identified implementing agencies, namely Assam Energy Development Agency, Assam State Electricity Board and the State Forest Department. No proposal has, however, been received from the state for using biogas energy for village electrification.

(c) 92 remote villages in the districts of Barpeta and undivided Kokrajhar and Bongaigaon, out of which the new district of Chirang has been carved out, are included in the list of villages for which financial assistance has been approved. No proposal has been received from the state implementing agencies for such assistance for any village in the district of Nalbari.

Power projects in Rajasthan

256. SHRI LALIT KISHORE CHATURVEDI: Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) the details of power projects and programmes being implemented and still pending, which were proposed during the Tenth Five Year Plan by Government, for development of power in Rajasthan;

(b) whether Government has proposed to formulate and implement more power projects during the Eleventh Five Year Plan in the State, which is facing severe power shortage;

(c) if so, the details thereof; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH): (a) to (d) Two projects namely, Barsingsar Lignite TPP (2x125 MW) and Mathania ISCC (140 MW) have slipped from the original 10th Plan capacity addition plan of Rajasthan. Mathania ISCC Project was dropped due to non-finalization of gas supply agreement (GSA) and non-placement of main plant equipment order. Unit I of Barsingsar Lignite TPP (2x125 MW) is scheduled to be commissioned in 2008-09, while Unit-2 is scheduled to be commissioned in 2009-10.

For the 11th Plan, a capacity addition target of 3,560 MW has been set for the state of Rajasthan, the details are given in the table given below:

Sl. No.	Name	Agency	Category	Fuel Type	Likely Benefits During 11th Plan (MW)	Likely Year of Benefits
	Central Sector					
1.	Barsingsar Lignite	NLC	UC	Lignite	250	2009-10
2.	Rapp U5&6	NPC	UC	Nuclear	440	2008-09
	Sub Total (Rajasthan)-Central Sector				690	
	State & Private Sector					
1.	Giral U-2	RRVUNL	UC	Lignite	125	2008-09
2.	Chabra TPS	RRVUNL	UC	Coal	500	2009-10
3.	Chabra-II TPS	RRVUNL	UC	Coal	500	2011-12
4.	Kota U7	RRVUNL	UC	Coal	195	2009-10
5.	Suratgarh Ext	RRVUNL	UC	Coal	250	2009-10
6.	Dholpur GT2+ST	RRVUNL	COMND	Gas/LNG	220	2007-08
	Sub Total (Rajasthan)-State Sector				1790	
7.	Jalipa Lignite	Raj west Power	UC	Lignite	1080	2009-11
	Sub total (Rajasthan)-Private Sector			1080		
	Total (Rajasthan)				3560	

COMND: Commissioned; UC: Projects under construction; C: Central Sector; S: State Sector; P: Private Sector

Under the Investment Component of Accelerated Power Development and Reforms Programme (APDRP) 29 Projects amounting to Rs. 1193.25 crore were sanctioned for Rajasthan during 10th Plan. The share of Government of India in the total was Rs. 491.23 crore (Rs. 192.92 crore as Loan and 298.31 crore as Grant). Government of India has released Rs.434.28 crore (Rs 192.92 crore as Loan and Rs. 241.36 crore as Grant). The State has arranged Rs. 415.53 crore from Financial Institutions/own resources. The State has utilized Rs. 762.36 crore (64%) out of the sanctioned project cost. An amount of Rs. 137.71 crore has also been released to Rajasthan as incentive for achieving reduction of cash loss under the incentive component of the programme.

Under the Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidyutikaran Yojana (RGGVY), during the 10th Plan, 25 projects at a cost of Rs. 453.23 crore were sanctioned for Rajasthan. These projects covered the electrification of 15608 villages and 1009310 rural households. During the 11th Plan, 16 projects at a cost of Rs. 614.80 crore were sanctioned for the electrification of 19233 villages covering 1221077 rural households in Rajasthan.

Share of Rajasthan in hydro-electric projects of Punjab

†257. SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA: Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Central Government proposes to send the claim relating to the share of Rajasthan in hydro-electric projects of Punjab to the Supreme Court for its advice; and

(b) if not, the reasons therefor and the steps to be taken by the Central Government to prescribe the share of Rajasthan in projects specified in the agreement?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH): (a) and (b) An agreement was reached between the States of Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan and Government of India on 10.05.1984 wherein it was agreed that in view of the claims raised by Haryana and Rajasthan for sharing of power in Anandpur Sahib Hydel Project, Mukerian Hydel Project, Thein Dam project, UBDC Stage-II and Shahpur Kandi hydel Scheme, the Government of India shall refer the matter to the Supreme Court for its opinion. The opinion of the Supreme Court was to be sought on whether the States of Rajasthan and Haryana are entitled to a share in the power generated from these hydel schemes and in case they are, what would be the share of each State.

However, subsequently in the discussions held between the Chief Ministers of Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan on 29-30 July, 1992 and 6th August, 1992, a consensus was reached not to refer the matter to the Supreme Court. It was also decided that the States would come to a reasonable agreement through mutual consultations. In order to resolve the issue amicably, a number of formal and informal discussions have taken place. However, no consensus has emerged so far due to the divergent views of the stakeholder States. Meanwhile, the State of

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.